

From: NORSKPOLE@aol.com@inetgw
To: Microsoft ATR
Date: 1/2/02 6:05pm
Subject: Microsoft Settlement

The provisions that the hold-out states, including my own state of California, are not directed toward a fair and reasonable settlement of the case against Microsoft. Instead, they blatantly provide unfair advantages to software companies in their own states.

A review of the provisions these states wants against the product offering of the companies they favor, will reveal that the bulk of the provisions have nothing to do with the Windows or Office programs which are the core for any statement that Microsoft has a monopoly which and that they have unfairly taken advantage of that monopoly..

I am not a stockholder nor am I an employee of Microsoft. My position against further punishment of Microsoft is that I firmly believe that the ability of business to communicate using standard programs has been a major contributor to the major growth that occurred during the 1980's and 1990's. Microsoft Office was chosen by most businesses as a standard, against a competition that was fragmented, with one company providing text programs, another providing spreadsheets, another providing presentations. Although the competitor's had very good products, they were not integrated. Microsoft had the vision to do the job right, but is now being punished.

It is my view that the case against Microsoft has been for political gain, and that the merits of the case against Microsoft are weak. It has already been established that the initial case against Microsoft was highly prejudiced. Further prejudice against this great contributor to American business is not justified.

Bernard E. Nelson
1469 Blake St.
Orange, CA, 92867